

REMARKS

I. Introduction

With the addition of claim 10, claims 1 to 10 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 8 and 9.

II. Rejection of Claims 8 to 9 Under 35 U.S.C. §112

As regards the rejection of claims 8 to 9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, the Examiner will note that both claims have been amended, *inter alia*, to change the condition " $\tau_{600}/\tau_{550} \leq 0.8$ " to $--\tau_{600}/\tau_{550} \geq 0.8--$, thereby obviating the rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 1 to 4 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1 to 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,992,720 ("Kaneda"). It is respectfully submitted that Kaneda does not anticipate these claims for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 relates to an electronic imaging system comprising a zoom lens system and an electronic image pickup device located on an image side thereof so that an image of a subject can be formed on a photoreceptive surface of the electronic image pickup device for conversion into electric signals, wherein: a stop has a constantly fixed aperture shape, and conditions (1) and (2) are satisfied: (1) $a \leq 4 \mu m$; and (2) $F > a$; where a is a horizontal pixel pitch in μm of the electronic image pickup device and F is an F-number of the zoom lens system at a wide-angle end thereof.

Although Applicant may not agree with the merits of the rejection, to facilitate matters, claim 1 has been amended without prejudice to recite, in relevant part, that *a stop has a constantly fixed aperture diameter*. Kaneda does not disclose, or even suggest, this feature. Kaneda describes an image pickup apparatus that includes zoom lens systems 111 to 114 and a CCD 1. Kaneda also describes a configuration in which an aperture stop unit 136 is provided in the zoom lens system. However, as indicated in column 14, lines 29 to 32 of Kaneda, the aperture stop unit 136 *changes* a diameter of an aperture thereof in accordance

with an instruction from a lens microcomputer 410. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Kaneda does not anticipate claim 1 for at least these reasons.

As for claims 2 and 3, which depend from claim 1 and therefore include all of the features of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Kaneda does not anticipate these dependent claims for at least the reasons set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 1.

As regards claim 4, this claim has been amended to recite that conditions (1') and (2) are satisfied: (1') $a \leq 2.5 \mu m$; and (2) $F > a$. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, on page 23, lines 9 to 12 of the Specification. Kaneda does not disclose, or even suggest, that conditions (1') and (2) are satisfied at the same time. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Kaneda does not anticipate claim 4 for at least these reasons.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claims 5 to 7 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5 to 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kaneda. It is respectfully submitted that Kaneda does not render these claims unpatentable for at least the following reasons.

Claims 5 to 7 depend from claim 4 and therefore include all of the features of claim 4. As set forth in greater detail in Section III of this response, Kaneda does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features of claim 4. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Kaneda does not render unpatentable claims 5 to 7, which depend from claim 4.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Allowable Subject Matter

As regards the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 8 and 9, the Examiner will note that claims 8 and 9 have been amended to be in independent form and to include all of the limitations of their respective base claims 1 and 4, prior to amendment. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 8 and 9 are in condition for immediate allowance.

VI. New Claim 10

New claim 10 has been added herein. It is respectfully submitted that claim 10 adds no new matter and is fully supported by the present application, including the Specification.

Since Kaneda does not disclose, or even suggest, the feature that conditions (1') and (2) are satisfied: (1') $a \leq 2.5 \mu\text{m}$; and (2) $F > a$, it is respectfully submitted that claim 10 is allowable over Kaneda.

VII. Conclusion

In view of all of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are in allowable condition. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 9, 2008

By: _____

Richard M. Rosati
(Reg. No. 31,792)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646